

REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 were pending in the Application, Claim 1 was rejected and Claims 2-4 were objected to. A previous restriction resulted in Claims 1-4 being elected and Claim 5 being withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, Claims 1-4 are amended, Claim 5 is canceled, and Claims 6-7 are added. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dudley, et al., (US 5,989,419). The Office Action alleged Claim 1 was obvious over the Reference as it was a small leap from conical grips to three-point gripping. But a major difference is the cartridges being held in the present invention have a closed end that will not permit the use of a single shaft or internal gripping as in Dudley '419.

Claim 1 is canceled in favor of Claims 6-7 which are a bit clearer and more precise. The use of separate spindles that rotate coaxially with each other and the cartridge is expressly recited. The three-point grips are referred to as "chucks", as such is an ordinary term commonly used in the tool industry. The fact that the chucks grip the outer perimeter of the cartridge, and that the cartridge has one closed end is expressly recited.

Claim 2 is amended to be in independent form and include the recitations of Claim 1. Claims 3-4 depend on Claim 2. The Office Action said that such an amendment would make Claims 2-4 allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 6-7 are now pending and in allowable form. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite matters, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2004

By: 

Richard B. Main
Reg. No. 33,258

Richard B. Main, Esq.
Patent Attorney
PO Box 1859
Los Altos, CA 94022
Telephone : 650-575-4624
Facsimile No.: 650-948-2009